

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Interview held on May 17, 2005 and for indicating that the proposed amendments to claim 1 overcome the art of record.

Claims 1-20 are pending. By this amendment, claims 1-9 and 13-20 are amended. Independent claims 1, 9, and 13 are amended to more precisely recite the features of the invention. Support for the amendment can be found at least at page 8, line 28 to page 9, line 3, page 9, line 27 to page 11, line 1, page 11, line 15 to page 12, line 9 of the specification. No new matter is introduced. Reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Entry of the above amendments is proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 because the amendments (1) place the claims in better form for appeal if needed; and (2) do not introduce any elements requiring further search by the Examiner.

**Cross Reference to Related Applications**

The specification has been amended to include PTO serial numbers of related applications.

**35 U.S.C. § 101 Rejections**

Claims 1-8 and 13-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Claims 1-8 and 13-20 have been amended to recite a “computer implemented method.” Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 is respectfully requested.

**35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections**

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,485,370 to Moss et al. (hereafter Moss). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Moss is directed to a system and method that provide communication between a user-friendly terminal and a number of service provider computers such as financial institutions. As agreed upon during the Interview, Moss does not disclose or suggest “the user is authorized to run a requested tool if the user is assigned with one or more of the enabled roles associated with the requested tool on all of the target nodes,” as recited in amended claim 1. Specifically, Moss does not use a role based authorization model to validate user’s authorization. Since Moss does not disclose or suggest all of the features of amended claim 1, claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2-8 are allowable at least because they depend from allowable claim 1 and for the additional features they recite.

With respect to claim 9, for at least the same reason as discussed with respect to claim 1, Moss does not disclose or suggest “the user is authorized to run a requested tool if the user

is assigned with one or more of the enabled roles associated with the requested tool on all of the target nodes,” as recited in amended claim 9. Therefore, claim 9 is allowable.

Claims 10-12 are allowable at least because they depend from allowable claim 9 and for the additional features they recite.

With respect to claim 13, for at least the same reason as discussed with respect to claim 1, Moss does not disclose or suggest “the user is authorized to run a requested tool if the user is assigned with one of the roles associated with the requested tool on all of the target nodes,” as recited in amended claim 13. Therefore, claim 13 is allowable.

Claims 14-20 are allowable because they depend from allowable claim 13 and for the additional features they recite.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) is respectfully requested.

In view of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance. Prompt examination and allowance are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desired in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant’s undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 17, 2005

  
Kelly T. Lee  
Registration No. 47,743  
**Andrews Kurth LLP**  
1701 Pennsylvania Ave, N.W.  
Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20006  
Tel. (202) 662-2736  
Fax (202) 662-2739